

a good compliment. The compliment that the distinguished Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, has just paid me can help me to survive for quite a long time. I shall not forget it. His words are a bit embellished, but I am deeply appreciative of what he has said.

I appreciate it very much. I thank him again for his good work every day on the floor of the Senate. Having been whip, I know when we have a good one. And Senator REID is here, looking after the Senate's business, and always very attendant upon our every need. I am ready to vote for him again any time. He does not have to look me up and find out if I am still for him.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. REID. Just one last comment while we are throwing compliments around this late Friday afternoon.

I can remember when I went and spoke to Senator BYRD, and he indicated he would support me 2 years ago for this job. And I wrote him a letter. I can very clearly remember writing it. It took a little time in thinking of what I wanted to say. In that letter I said that as far as I was concerned he was the Babe Ruth of the Senate. I don't know if you remember that letter, but that is what I said.

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I remember that letter.

Mr. REID. With Babe Ruth, you always think of the best baseball player. And when you think of ROBERT BYRD, you think of the best player in the Senate. Thank you.

Mr. BYRD. Yes. I believe it was September, in 1927, when Babe Ruth beat his own former record of 59 home runs. In 1927, he swatted 60 home runs.

Mr. REID. Senator BYRD, I can remember, as if it were yesterday, you asked me one weekend—

Mr. BYRD. I believe that was September 30, 1927. And I believe it was on the 22nd of September 1927 that Jack Dempsey and Gene Tunney fought a fight in which—we who lived in the coalfields hoped Jack Dempsey would win back his title, but he did not win it back. That was the occasion of the "long count."

It was in May of that year that Lindbergh flew across the ocean in the *Spirit of St. Louis*. Sometimes he was 10 feet above the water; sometimes he was 10,000 feet above the water. And his plane had a load, which I remember, of about 500 pounds. He carried five sandwiches, and ate one-half of a sandwich.

I remember reading in the New York Times about that historic flight. He said he flew over, I believe, what was Newfoundland, at the great speed of 100 miles per hour—at a great speed, 1927.

Mr. REID. Senator BYRD, I do not want to put you on the spot here, but I can remember returning from one of my trips in Nevada, and we had a conversation. You asked me what I had done, and I said, I hadn't read a particular book in 25 years. And I picked

up the book "Robinson Crusoe" to read about Robinson Crusoe. You said to me: I know how long he was on that island. I just read the book, and you told me. And I had to go home and check to see if you were right, and you were right, to the day.

Mr. BYRD. I believe that was 28 years, 2 months, and 19 days.

Mr. REID. Yes. I have not forgotten that.

Mr. BYRD. I believe that is right.

Mr. REID. I went home and checked, and I will do it again. I am confident you are right.

Mr. BYRD. All right. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

THE LATINO IMMIGRANT AND FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my good friend from West Virginia talked about his opposition to the provision in the bill dealing with Latino immigrant fairness. He and I have had a number of conversations about that. I, of course, respect his views as were just laid out here, his feelings on that piece of legislation.

Briefly, I would just say about this legislation that the Republicans have chosen to ignore what we felt is something that is very important. We have tried to have hearings. We have tried to do legislation on this. Simply, we were ignored.

We, of course, have met with our counterparts in the House. And they feel strongly about this. They have been ignored, just as we have over here. We have received the support of the administration to help us in crafting legislation that would protect what we believe is a basic tenet of American justice.

They have decided to ignore our bill and those who support it, and have decided to include their own immigration bill. The President has had no choice but to do this drastic maneuvering measure. We have tried, time and time again, to bring this bill to the floor, and it is always met by the other side's intransigence.

We have a simple goal: One of fairness. We want one set of rules for all refugees and immigrants. And we offer a clear plan to correct serious flaws in our immigration code. Meanwhile, the majority is trying to cloud the issues, distort our bill, and create an intricate maze that helps very few.

The current system is unworkable and unfair. Out plan aims to correct flaws in the current unworkable and biased immigration rules. For instance:

There is one set of rules for Cubans and Nicaraguan refugees who fled left-wing dictatorships; and another, far stricter set of rules for refugees from Central America, the Caribbean, and Liberia who fled other dictatorships;

Because Congress failed to renew Section 245(i), families who have a right to be together here in the U.S. are being torn apart, sometimes for up to 10 years; They are forced to leave their families and can't come back for 10 years. They haven't done anything illegal.

Because of past Congressional action and bureaucratic bungling, some people who were eligible for a legalization program enacted in 1986 are now U.S. citizens; while others are facing deportation.

Democrats want a simple set of fair rules that make sense and clean up the immigration code.

We want to establish legal parity between Central American, Liberian and Caribbean refugees so that all refugees who fled political turmoil in the 1990s are treated the same.

We want to renew 245(i). This provision, which has allowed all family members of U.S. citizens and legal permanent residents to adjust their status while in the U.S., has been allowed to expire. Our proposal would renew it and allow all immigrants who have a legal right to become permanent residents to apply for their green cards in the U.S. and remain here with their families while they wait for a decision.

The registry date would allow all persons who came to the U.S. before 1986 to be eligible to adjust their status. This provision has been regularly updated since enactment in 1929 but has not been updated since 1972.

Republicans now agree that Congress should help some immigrants, but their proposal provides no relief on parity, little on 245(i), and even less on the registry date.

When you read the fine print, their immigration proposals don't fix what is broken in our immigration code.

Instead, the majority wants to continue to pick and choose between immigrants and which countries they should come from—rewarding some, denying others, with no just cause.

We want a simple, fair, family unification policy. That's what we're proposing. That's what we'll fight for. That's what Congress must do before we adjourn.

The main reason I came to the floor today is to respond to my friend from Idaho who came to the floor to talk about some of the things the Vice President said that were exaggerations, according to him. I would like to comment on some of the statements he made. This is a difficult game. The game is that these men go around giving a lot of statements, Bush and GORE. And they should be held to the same standard. What is that standard? Listen to everything they say.

Now, we know from an October 23 Washington Post in a column written by Michael Kinsley entitled "The Emperor's New Brain" that:

George W. Bush's handling of the stupidity issue has been nothing short of brilliant. A

Martian watching the last presidential debate might have concluded that this man would be well-advised not to put quite so much emphasis on mental testing.

This has been raised by the Senator from Idaho, and I am happy to respond. The same article says:

But if George W. Bush isn't a moron, he is a man of impressive intellectual dishonesty and/or confusion. His utterances frequently make no sense on their own terms. His policy recommendations are often internally inconsistent and mutually contradictory.

He further states:

When he repeatedly attacks his opponents for "partisanship," does he get the joke? When he blames the absence of a federal patients' rights law on "a lot of bickering in Washington, D.C.," has he noticed that the bickering consists of his own party which controls Congress, blocking the legislation? When he summarizes, "It's kind of like a political issue as opposed to a people issue," does he mean to suggest anything in particular? Perhaps that politicians, when acting politically, ignore the wishes of the people?

In the debate, he declared, "I don't want to use food as a diplomatic weapon from this point forward. We shouldn't be using food. It hurts the farmers. It's not the right thing to do." When, just a few days later, he criticized legislation weakening the trade embargo on Cuba—which covers food along with everything else—had he rethought his philosophy on the issue? Or was there nothing to rethink.

The article ends by saying:

In short, does George W. Bush mean what he says, or does he understand it? The answer can't be both. And is both too much to ask for?

My friend from Idaho talked about some things that AL GORE had said over the years. We will talk about those in a minute. He said he was here because of some of the statements I made. I didn't make any statements. I came here without any editorial comment other than saying I was quoting direct, verbatim statements made by Gov. George Bush.

I am not going to go through the 20-odd pages of "Bushisms" or whatever you want to call them. I am going to talk about a few that obviously got the attention of my friend from Idaho.

Florence, SC, January 11, 2,000:

Rarely is the question asked: Is our children learning?

New York Times, October 23:

The important question is, How many hands have I shaken?

Concord, NH, January 29:

Will the highways on the Internet become more few?

Nashua, NH:

I know how hard it is for you to put food on your family.

New York Daily News, February 19:

I understand small business growth. I was one.

LaCrosse, WI, October 18, a few days ago:

Families is where our nation finds hope, where wings take dream.

Same day, WI:

Drug therapies are replacing a lot of medicines as we used to know it.

Saginaw, MI, September 29, a few weeks ago:

I know the human being and fish can coexist peacefully.

Redwood, CA, September 27:

I will have a foreign-handed foreign policy.

On the Oprah show:

I am a person who recognizes the fallacy of humans.

As I said, I have talked about some of the things he has said. I haven't in any way changed a single word, a single paragraph, a single spelling. I just quoted directly. This is a man who is running for President of the United States. I think it is something we need to consider, especially in light of the fact that on Wednesday, the Rand commission came out with a study. The Rand commission is bipartisan. They are widely respected. They are independent. Basically what they said is that all the claims that Governor Bush has made about education in Texas, how it has improved, simply are false, not true. Then we have the next day, on Thursday, the Actuary Commission came out and said that if you took into consideration all of the things that Governor Bush wanted to do with Social Security and taxes, it would, in effect, bankrupt the country.

I think we have to recognize that Governor Bush is talking about some real big whoppers, if the Senator from Idaho wants to talk about whoppers.

In fact, the Wall Street Journal, which is deemed by some to be the newspaper of the Republican Party, had in a news story, dated October 12 of the year 2000, a headline saying "The Biggest Whopper: The Bush Tax Cut."

Among other things, the article says:

Writing before last night's debate, the winner for the biggest exaggeration is easy: George W. Bush and his tax cut.

The GOP nominee claims his tax measure principally will help the working poor and middle-class Americans. The rich, he says, will get a smaller percentage than they currently do, and the tax plan comfortably fits with projected budget surpluses and his Social Security plans.

None of that is true.

Instead of making the case that a huge tax cut is necessary to reward the productive elements of society who will make the investments that ultimately benefit everyone, Mr. Bush misrepresents the size and shape of his proposal. He suggests that after setting aside half of the 10-year surplus for Social Security, he will divide the rest between tax cuts and initiatives in areas like education, health care and defense. In truth, he proposes over \$1.3 trillion in tax cuts and less than \$500 billion for those other initiatives, not including \$196 billion of unspecified reductions in discretionary spending.

The biggest whopper:

The Bush claim that his tax cut not only doesn't reward the rich but actually makes them pay more is really phony.

The article goes on to say:

The Republican nominee has been unsparing in his criticism of the Clinton-Gore ad-

ministration's defense spending, claiming more needs to be done on pay, readiness and missile defense. Yet over the decade, the Gore budget envisions spending \$55 million more than Mr. Bush proposes. Why? The Texan can't afford it, given his tax cuts.

The press has tripped all over itself to praise Mr. Bush for suggesting a "solution" to long-term Social Security with partial privatization. Yet unlike the serious Social Security proposals—such as Senators Pat Moynihan and Bob Kerrey—Mr. Bush insists he can do this without any cuts in Social Security benefits.

Of course, Mr. President, that is indicated in the study by the actuaries as absolutely impossible; it can't be done. And "In His Own Words" in the New York Thursday, October 26, 2000, there were remarks out of Sanford, Florida, where George W. Bush said:

They're trying to say, you know, old George W. is going to take away your check. But I'm going to set aside \$2.4 trillion of Social Security surplus.

On October 17, in the debate, here is what he said:

... And one of my promises is going to be Social Security reform. And you bet we need to take a trillion dollar—a trillion dollars out of that \$2.4 trillion surplus.

Well, he heads to Florida and then increases it by \$1.4 trillion. With all due respect, I am not sure that the good Governor understands. According to people who have studied the issue, he doesn't. You can't do both. You can't cut Social Security and think that those moneys that are set aside to pay benefits can also be taken out to put into privatization. It won't work.

My friend from Idaho said today that one of the things that AL GORE is considered to be untruthful about is his statement that he was involved in the authorship of the book that was made into a great movie by Erich Segal called Love Story. He is saying it is simply untrue that AL GORE had anything to do with that. But understand that the author of the book, who I think should have some foundation to speak about the book he wrote, says that his protagonist, Oliver Barret IV—the man in Love Story—was partly based on Mr. GORE. Now, that is a fact. Erich Segal, the author, said that his protagonist in the book Love Story, Oliver Barret IV, was based on ALBERT GORE. So what my friend from Idaho said, and what others have said, cannot contradict what the author of the book has said.

Talking about exaggerations and misstatements, look at the Seattle Post-Intelligencer on October 4 of this year. Byline, Paul Krugman. He says:

I really, truly wasn't planning to write any more columns about George W. Bush's arithmetic. But his performance on "Moneyline" last Wednesday was just mind-blowing. I had to download a transcript to convince myself that I had really heard him correctly.

It was as if Bush aides had prepared him with a memo saying: "You've said some things on the stump that weren't true. Your mission, in the few minutes you have, is to

repeat all those things. Don't speak in generalities—give specific false numbers. That'll show them."

First, Bush talked about the budget—"There's about \$4.6 trillion of surplus projected," he declared, which is true, even if the projections are dubious. He went on to say: "I want some of the money, nearly a trillion, to go to projects like prescription drugs for seniors. Money to strengthen the military to keep the peace. I've got some views about education around the world. I want to—you know, I've got some money in there for the environment."

Figure that one out, if you can.

Mr. President, further in the *New York Times* of October 11, a man by the name of Paul Krugman writes a column, and the heading is: "A Retirement Fable; No Fuzzy Numbers Needed."

Among other things, he says:

Mr. Bush has made an important political discovery. Really big misstatements, it turns out, cannot be effectively challenged, because voters can't believe that a man who seems so likable would do that sort of thing. In last week's debate Mr. Bush again declared that he plans to spend a quarter of the surplus on popular new programs, even though his own budget shows he plans to spend less than half that much. . . . And he insists that he has a plan to save Social Security, when his actual proposal, as it stands, would bankrupt the system.

Michael Kinsley, in the *Washington Post*, on the 24th, a couple days ago, says, among other things, referring to Bush:

His utterances frequently make no sense in their own terms. His policy recommendations are often internally inconsistent and mutually contradictory. Because it's harder to explain and prove, intellectual dishonesty doesn't get the attention that petty fibbing does, even though intellectual dishonesty indicts both a candidate's character and his policy positions. All politicians. . . get away with more of it than they should. But George W. gets away with an extraordinary amount of it.

He continues to say.

. . . he'll get the trillion dollars needed for his partial privatization "out of the surplus." Does he not understand that the current surplus is committed to future benefits, which will have to be cut to make the numbers work? Or does he understand and not care?

Kinsley further says:

When he repeatedly attacks his opponent for "partisanship," does he get the joke? When he blames the absence of a federal patients' rights law on "a lot of bickering in Washington, DC," has he noticed that the bickering consists of his own party, which controls Congress, blocking the legislation?

Also, if we are talking about people who misstate things, let's really put a magnifying glass on some of the things that the Governor has said. In last week's debate, GORE described his own education plan, but Bush said that the "three" men convicted in the murder of James Byrd, a black man dragged to his death from his pickup truck, will receive the death penalty. That is not quite true. One faces life imprisonment. Bush took credit for expanding a

child's health insurance program in Texas. He took credit in the debate for working with the Democrats to get a Patients' Bill of Rights. He vetoed that. And then he says we have a provision to allow lawsuits. He didn't sign that.

Mr. President, we hear a lot about how the Vice President has been involved in the Russian situation. And he has. He has done a good deal to work out differences between the two nations—the former Soviet Union and now Russia. The Vice President has had extensive experience working on that. One of the people he worked with was Prime Minister Chernomyrdin, who he didn't pick, the Russian government picked him. In this debate—we all heard it—and I will get the citations from the *Washington Post*, byline by Howard Kurtz and others. He said:

Money from the International Monetary Funded wound up in the pocket of former Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin. Chernomyrdin has been linked to corruption.

Experts say there is no proof he received any IMF money.

Further, Bush said that our European friends would put troops on the ground in the Balkans, where the bulk of the peacekeeping forces are in Bosnia and Kosovo. Bush also cited Haiti as example of a country from which the U.S. should withdraw its troops, when in fact all but 100 troops have left.

Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho said he will be back Monday afternoon. I am happy to visit with him on the statements that the Governor of the State of Texas has made. I didn't make them, he made them. I simply came to the Senate floor to discuss with the American people what he has said:

I am a person who recognizes the fallacy of humans.

Drug therapies are replacing a lot of medicines as we used to know it.

I know the human being and fish can coexist peacefully.

I will have a foreign-handed foreign policy.

Families is where our nation finds hope, where wings take dream.

I understand small business growth. . . . I was one.

Will the highways on the Internet become more few?

I know how hard it is for you to put food on your family.

Rarely is the question asked: Is our children learning?

The important question is, how many hands have I shaken?

These are statements made by the Governor of the State of Texas.

Anytime anyone wants to come and talk to me about the statements made by the Governor of the State of Texas, I am happy to do it. I didn't make them up. I am quoting them directly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, thank you very much.

MEDICARE BALANCED BUDGET REFINEMENT PROPOSAL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to first commend my colleague, friend, Senator REID from Nevada, for not only his statement but his leadership in this body to try to move the process along. Unfortunately, we have reached an impasse.

We have sent to the President an appropriations bill for the Commerce-State-Justice Departments which will be vetoed because of glaring deficiencies in that bill.

We are holding in abeyance for the moment a conference report which not only deals with Medicare readjustments because of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, but also contains provisions dealing with assisted suicide—a hodgepodge of issues, all of which will, once again, elicit a Presidential veto.

Let me just speak for a moment about this pending bill, although in some respects it defies description. It is more of an accumulation of different ideas thrown together to get out of town. But part of it deals with Medicare and balanced budget refinement proposals.

All of us in this body for the last several years have been pointing out some of the consequences—many of them unintended—of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 with respect to Medicare reimbursement in an effort to make sure that our health care system continues to be vibrant and continues to be sustainable. And we are resolved to try to address these issues and in a bipartisan way.

But we have found ourselves with a very partisan approach—an approach that has not included any of my Democratic colleagues on the Finance Committee, and has included no real participation by the Democrats in this body at all with respect to issues that are of concern to all of us which should be dealt with on a bipartisan basis.

As a result, we are faced with legislation that comes to us which is terribly distorted and terribly slanted, and which will not deal with the real crisis we face. In fact, many health care providers, such as hospitals, home health care agencies, hospice agencies, nursing homes, and others are literally being shortchanged in the process where a significant and inordinate amount of money is going to HMOs that operate Medicare managed care plans.

These are the same HMOs that abruptly, in many cases, withdrew from the market because they could not make their margins—that walked out on seniors. And, in effect, we are rewarding them for abandoning seniors and walking away from them by giving them a huge amount of money with the presumption, of course, that this money will be passed on to the providers who care for our elderly and disabled. That is not the case at all.